



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,801	04/27/2001	Masakazu Suzuki	125A 3110	2553

7590 01/12/2005
KODA & ANDROLIA
Suite 3850
2029 Century Park East
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3024

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/844,801

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

Steven P Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appears on the c ver sheet with th correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18,20,22,24-33,35 and 36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19,21,23 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The amendment filed 7/1/04 has been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 19, 21, 23, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (6677944) and Nishino (5623583) and Knapp et al (5454069).

4. Regarding claim 19, Yamamoto shows displaying three dimensional data as a combination of three sectional images of an X-section, Y-section, and Z-section (column 2 lines 14-35 and 50-57, column 4 lines 30-55, column 9 lines 15-27, column 13 lines 15-46, column 14 lines 30-45) by processing three dimensional data obtained by imaging (column 14 lines 15-30). Yamamoto does not specifically say that the sections orthogonalize each other, but does mention maximizing the utilization of section information to make the model. Furthermore, Nishino shows using orthogonal sections to each other (Nishino column 14 lines 30-46, column 10 lines 25-57 for

Art Unit: 2174

example) to maximize utilization of the section information to make the model – orthogonal sections do not have any overlap of component information. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have the sections orthogonal to each other in Yamamoto, because it would maximize utilization of section information to make the model. Yamamoto shows preparing in advance sectional images of sections parallel to the X, Y, and Z sections by slicing data from the three dimensional data (Yamamoto column 13 lines 15-42, column 15 lines 13-43). Yamamoto does not necessarily show slicing the data at a predetermined interval, but does mention efficient obtaining of the data. Furthermore, Knapp et al shows efficient obtaining of the data by preparing in advance the taking of 'slices' at regular intervals (column 2 lines 12-32, column 3 lines 25-60, column 5 lines 3-40). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to do this in Yamamoto, because it would allow efficient obtaining of the data. Yamamoto shows efficient displaying as a list displaying mode sectional images selected from the X, Y, Z images previously prepared (Figures 5, 26, 27, column 16 lines 30-44, column 17 lines 30-45, column 18 lines 55-66). Yamamoto does not specifically show the images being in a series per se, but Knapp et al do (column 4 lines 55-65, column 5 lines 25-45) for efficient displaying in a list display mode. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Yamamoto, because it would provide efficient displaying in a list display mode.

5. Claims 21, 23, and 34 show the same features as claim 19 and are rejected for the same reasons.

6. Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24-33, 35-36 are allowable over the prior art of record. The additional features that sequentially change and display the sectional images, with cursor and other interface techniques, combined, bring out new inventive concepts which are not set forth in the prior art of record.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19, 21, 23, 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER